



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/702,466 10/31/00 DENEN

D LLT-259-A

MM41/1107

THOMAS E BEJIN
YOUNG & BASILE P C
3001 WEST BIG BEAVER ROAD SUITE 624
TROY MI 48084

EXAMINER

IP, S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2837

DATE MAILED: 11/07/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trad marks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/702,466

Applicant(s)

DENEN ET AL.

Examiner

Paul Ip

Art Unit

2837

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2 and 18-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers


- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: 

Art Unit: 2837

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 2, 18-25 and 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 2 is dependent on cancelled claim 1. Claim 2 is not mentioned in the preliminary amendment. It is not clear whether claim 2 was cancelled or not.

Claims 18-25 and 28-32 are functional because claims 18 and 28 begin with the functional language "For use..." Furthermore, the preamble of claims 18 and 28 are inconsistent with the dependent claims. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 18-22, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Koike et al. '903.

See figures 1 and 7.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2837

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. Claims 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koike et al. '903 in view of Young et al. '815.

Claims 23-25 further require an alternate power source and gradually supply power control. However, the patent to Young et al. discloses a model train horn control system comprising a backup power source for controlling a model train. Prima facie case is made that the use of DC power source as an alternate power source for model trains is well known in the art. In light of Young et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Koike et al. with an alternate power source as taught or suggested by Young et al.

8. Claims 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koike et al. '903 in view of Olmsted et al. '604 or Severson et al. ('431 or '048).

Claims 28-32 also includes radio control, short circuit protection, and a memory for storing information. However, the patents to Olmsted et al. and Severson et al. disclose computer control model trains including a voltage protection. Prima facie case is made that the use of computer control with a memory and voltage protection for model train control are well known in the art. In light of Olmsted et al. or Severson et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Koike et al. with the feature as taught or suggested by Olmsted et al. or Severson et al.

Art Unit: 2837

Citation Of Pertinent References

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The patents to Collier '920, Carolan '517, Stern et al. '016 and '416, Fine et al. '285, Takemoto et al. '237, Severson et al. ('005, '068, and '017) are sound generating devices for model trains.

The patents to Gordon et al. '030, Storm '402, Ireland '001 and '552, and Severson et al. '939 disclose voltage protection for model trains.

Communication Information

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Ip whose telephone number is (703)-308-3098. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 am to 3:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Nappi can be reached on 703-308-3370. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)-305-3431 for regular communications and (703)-305-3431 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.



Paul Ip
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2837

November 1, 2001